arXiv:1211.2974v1 [math.FA] 13 Nov 2012

NORM-CONTROLLED INVERSION IN SMOOTH BANACH ALGEBRAS, II

KARLHEINZ GRÖCHENIG AND ANDREAS KLOTZ

ABSTRACT. We show that smoothness implies norm-controlled inversion: the smoothness of an element a in a Banach algebra with a one-parameter automorphism group is preserved under inversion, and the norm of the inverse a^{-1} is controlled by the smoothness of a and by spectral data. In our context smooth subalgebras are obtained with the classical constructions of approximation theory and resemble spaces of differentiable functions, Besov spaces or Bessel potential spaces. To treat ultra-smoothness, we resort to Dales-Davie algebras. Furthermore, based on Baskakov's work, we derive explicit norm control estimates for infinite matrices with polynomial off-diagonal decay. This is a quantitative version of Jaffard's theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

Norm control refers to the phenomenon that in a Banach algebra the norm of an invertible element can be controlled solely by its smoothness and by spectral data.

The prototype of norm-controlled inversion occurs already for differentiable functions. Let $C^1(\mathbb{T})$ be the algebra of continuously differentiable functions on the torus $\mathbb{T}$ and $C(\mathbb{T})$ be the algebra of all continuous functions on the torus with the norms $\|f\|_C = \|f\|_\infty = \max_{t\in\mathbb{T}} |f(t)|$ and $\|f\|_{C^1} = \|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty$. The quotient rule $(1/f)' = -f'/f^2$ leads to an obvious estimate for the C^1-norm of $1/f$, namely,

$$\|\tfrac{1}{f}\|_{C^1} \leq \|\tfrac{1}{f}\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty \|\tfrac{1}{f}\|_\infty^2 \leq \Big(\|f\|_{C^1}\|\tfrac{1}{f}\|_C + 1\Big)\|\tfrac{1}{f}\|_C \,. \tag{1}$$

Here $\|f\|_{C^1}$ is a measure for the smoothness of f, whereas $\delta = \min_{t\in\mathbb{T}}|f(t)|)$ is the smallest spectral value of f and thus $\|f^{-1}\|_C = 1/\delta$ measures a significant parameter of the spectrum of f in $C(\mathbb{T})$.

In general, we say that a subalgebra $\mathcal{A}$ of a unital Banach algebra $\mathcal{B}$ admits norm-controlled inversion if there exists a function $h: \mathbb{R}_+^2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ that satisfies

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq h(\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}, \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}}) \tag{2}$$

for all invertible elements of $\mathcal{B}$. In particular, the invertibility of $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in the larger algebra $\mathcal{B}$ implies the invertibility of a in the smaller algebra $\mathcal{A}$ *and* also the control of the norm of the inverse. Since the norm $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is related to the condition number of a in the larger algebra $\mathcal{A}$, norm-controlled inversion implies a quantitative estimate for the condition number in $\mathcal{B}$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 41A65,46H30,47L99,47A60, 42A10,47B47.

Key words and phrases. Inverse-closed Banach algebra, norm-control, Besov space, Bessel algebra, off-diagonal decay of matrices, iterated quotient rule.

This research was supported by the project P22746-N13 of the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF).

The investigation of norm-controlled inversion goes back to the work of Baskakov [2] and Nikolski [21]. Baskakov studied the behavior of the off-diagonal decay of infinite matrices under inversion. Nikolski studied the lack of norm control for the algebra of absolutely convergent Fourier series in $C(\mathbb{T})$ and showed that a modest amount of additional smoothness, as described by weighted absolutely convergent Fourier series, yields norm-controlled inversion in $C(\mathbb{T})$ [8, 21].

Our own work [12, 18, 19] was motivated by the desire to develop a systematic theory of inverse-closedness and norm-controlled inversion and to understand which properties of a subalgebra imply norm-controlled inversion. In [13] we introduced the abstract definition (2) and showed that norm-controlled inversion is possible with an extremely weak notion of smoothness. The main result of [13] can be formulated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{B}$ is a C^*-algebra and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is a $*$-subalgebra with a common unit and a differential (semi-) norm, i.e., $\|\cdot\|$ satisfies the inequality*

$$\|ab\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq C(\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|b\|_{\mathcal{B}} + \|b\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|a\|_{\mathcal{B}}) \tag{3}$$

for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq C_1 \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 \, e^{C_2 \log^2(\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}})} .$$

Note that in this estimate the dependence of $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\delta^{-1} = \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is faster than any polynomial, whereas in the motivating example $C^1(\mathbb{T})$ it is just δ^{-2}.

In this paper we will impose more structure on the ambient algebra $\mathcal{B}$ and will investigate stronger notions of smoothness in a Banach algebra. Our goal is to derive stronger quantitative estimates for norm-controlled inversion. On an abstract level we develop a systematic construction of "smooth" subalgebras that admit norm-controlled inversion. On a concrete level we investigate Banach algebras of infinite matrices and find explicit quantitative estimates for the off-diagonal decay of the inverse.

Let us describe the main conclusions in more detail.

(a) *"Smoothness implies norm controlled inversion."* We will derive several theorems that give a precise meaning to this meta-theorem. In operator theory, smooth elements in a Banach algebra are usually defined by a derivation, quite in analogy to the definition of the function space $C^n(\mathbb{T})$ of n-times continuously differentiable functions on the torus $\mathbb{T}$. This analogy motivated the non-commutative approximation theory in [12]. One of the main insights was that the standard constructions of smoothness spaces for functions possess a non-commutative analogue for Banach algebras. In particular, for a Banach algebra with a (one parameter) automorphism group one can define subalgebras that correspond to Hölder-Lipschitz spaces or to Besov spaces or to Bessel potential spaces. Whereas the main results of [12, 18] can be paraphrased by saying that "smoothness" in a Besov subalgebra is preserved under inversion (a qualitative result), we will derive quantitative versions, i.e., we will derive explicit results about the norm-controlled inversion in such subalgebras. Typically, the notation of a smooth subalgebra contains a smoothness parameter r, for instance, the notation of the Besov subalgebra $\mathcal{C} = \Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})$ of a Banach algebra $\mathcal{A}$ indicates that $\mathcal{C}$ consists of elements with smoothness r. For such subalgebras we will prove the norm-controlled inversion of the form

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq C \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{r+1} \|a\|_{\mathcal{C}}^{r} . \tag{4}$$

The precise definitions and formulations are somewhat more technical and contained in Theorems 2.5, 2.9 and 2.12. These theorems can be seen as a vast generalization of the quotient rule (1). To our knowledge these results are new even for Besov spaces on the torus.

(b) *Norm-controlled inversion and off-diagonal decay of infinite matrices.* Perhaps the most important application of norm-controlled inversion is to Banach algebras of infinite matrices. The relevant algebra is $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$ of bounded operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, and the smoothness of an matrix amounts to its off-diagonal decay. The prototypical result is Jaffard's theorem [16]: If $A = (A(k,l))_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is an infinite matrix with off-diagonal decay

$$|A(k,l)| \leq C(1+|k-l|)^{-r} \qquad k,l \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad r>1, \tag{5}$$

and if A is (boundedly) invertible on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, then there exists a constant C' such that

$$|A^{-1}(k,l)| \leq C'(1+|k-l|)^{-r} \qquad k,l \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus the quality of the off-diagonal decay is preserved. In the language of Banach algebras Jaffard's theorem states that the algebra of matrices with polynomial off-diagonal decay of order r is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$.This powerful result had many important applications in wavelet theory [16], time-frequency analysis [9], frame theory [10], and numerical analysis [15]. We also refer to [11] for a survey of this topic. We emphasize that Jaffard's theorem shows only the existence of a constants C' for the inverse matrix and is thus a purely qualitative result. For numerical purposes, however, it is of utmost importance to understand how big the constant C' for the decay of A^{-1} can be. In our language, we need to solve the problem whether Jaffard's algebra admits norm-controlled inversion.

Although polynomial off-diagonal decay is related to the axiomatic construction of Besov algebras and Bessel algebras, the Banach algebra defined by the decay conditions (5) cannot be realized directly within the abstract theory. Therefore neither the inverse-closedness nor the norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$ follow directly from our theory and require deeper ideas. A proof of the norm-controlled inversion of Jaffard's algebra is implicit in the deep work of Baskakov [2]. Unfortunately he stopped short of deriving explicit estimates, and thus his fundamental result has not received as much attention as it deserves. In this paper we make the extra step and prove the following explicit quantitative version of Jaffard's theorem.

Theorem 1.2 (Quantitative version of Jaffard's theorem)**.** *Assume that the infinite matrix A is (boundedly) invertible on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ and that it possesses off-diagonal decay of order $r>1$ as in (5) with minimal constant C. Then the inverse matrix possesses the off-diagonal decay*

$$|A^{-1}(k,l)| \leq C_r C^{2r+2+\frac{2}{r-1}} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+3+\frac{2}{r-1}},$$

where C_r is a constant depending only on $r>1$.

Again, the norm of the inverse depends only on the smoothness, which in this case corresponds to the off-diagonal decay of A, and spectral information of A on ℓ^2. The formulation is similar to the theorem of Demko, Moss, and Smith on the exponential decay of the inverse of a banded matrix [7], but the proof of Theorem 1.2 is much more difficult. A weaker form of norm-controlled inversion was studied in [22].

(c) In a sense much of the theory of non-commutative smoothness spaces amounts to studying approximation theory with weights of polynomial growth. A corresponding theory for weights of super-polynomial growth is much less developed. In this paper we choose the notion of Dales-Davie algebras to study subalgebras of a given Banach algebra that are associated to a weight of super-polynomial growth. The elements in the Dales-Davie algebras correspond to ultra-smooth elements. Our main result states that a Dales-Davie algebra admits norm-controlled inversion.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we recall several possible concepts of smoothness in a Banach algebra and define Besov algebras, Bessel algebras, and Dales-Davie algebras. We prove the explicit norm-controlled inversion for each of these classes of subalgebras. In Section 3 we apply the abstract results to concrete Banach algebras of matrices and derive a quantitative version of Jaffard's theorem. The appendix contains the proofs of the higher-order quotient rules for derivations and difference operators.

2. NORM CONTROLLED INVERSION: IMPROVED ESTIMATES BY QUOTIENT RULES

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be Banach algebras with common unit element. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ admits norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{B}$, if there is a function $h : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ that satisfies

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq h(\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}, \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}}) \,.$$

If we only know that $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}$ implies $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}$, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{B}$.

The control function h in this definition is not unique and it is often convenient to describe norm-controlled inversion in a slightly different way.

Lemma 2.1 ([13])**.** *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be Banach algebras with common unit element. Then $\mathcal{A}$ admits norm control, if and only if there exists a function $\phi : (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}_+$, such that, for $a \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq 1 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 1/\delta \tag{6}$$

implies that $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \phi(\delta) \,.$$

Explicitly, $\phi(\delta)$ can be chosen to be

$$\phi(\delta) = \sup\{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \colon \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq 1, \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 1/\delta\} \,. \tag{7}$$

The norm control function h is then

$$h(\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}, \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}}) = \frac{1}{\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \phi\Big(\frac{1}{\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}}}\Big) \,. \tag{8}$$

2.1. Domains of Derivations Admit Norm Controlled Inversion.

An unbounded *derivation* D on a Banach algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a *closed* linear mapping $\mathrm{D}\colon \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{A}$ with *domain* $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D},\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ that satisfies the Leibniz rule

$$\mathrm{D}(ab) = a\mathrm{D}(b) + \mathrm{D}(a)b \qquad \text{for all } a,b \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{9}$$

We always choose a maximal domain and endow it with the seminorm $|a|_{\mathcal{D}} = \|\mathrm{D}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the graph norm $\|a\|_{\mathcal{D}} = \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} + |a|_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then $\mathcal{D}$ is again a Banach algebra.

Remark. It should be observed that we do not assume the domain of $\mathcal{D}$ to be dense in $\mathcal{A}$. This is important for some of the matrix algebras that serve as examples in Section 3.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a $*$-algebra, we assume that the derivation and the domain are symmetric, i.e., $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^*$ and $\mathrm{D}(a^*) = \mathrm{D}(a)^*$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}$.

For derivations the following version of the quotient rule is valid.

Proposition 2.2 ([12, 3.4], [4, 17]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a symmetric Banach algebra and* D *be a symmetric derivation on $\mathcal{A}$. If $e \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$, then $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, the quotient rule*

$$\mathrm{D}(a^{-1}) = -a^{-1}\mathrm{D}(a)a^{-1} \tag{10}$$

is valid.

The quotient rule yields an immediate statement about norm control in $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$.

Corollary 2.3. *Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a symmetric Banach algebra with a closed derivation* D *and $e \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$. Then $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D},\mathcal{A})$ admits norm control in $\mathcal{A}$. Precisely, if $a \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D},\mathcal{A})$ and a is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$, then*

$$|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}} \le \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 |a|_{\mathcal{D}}$$

In particular, if $|a|_{\mathcal{D}} \le 1$ and $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \le 1/\delta$, then

$$|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}} \le 1/\delta^2 .$$

If $\|a\|_{\mathcal{D}} \le 1$ and $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \le 1/\delta$, then

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \le 1/\delta + 1/\delta^2 .$$

Norm Controlled Inversion in $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$. We next formulate higher order versions of this statement.

The domain of D^k is defined by induction as $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k) = \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D},\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^{k-1}))$. In analogy to $C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we equip $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$ with the seminorm

$$|a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^m(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{m!}$$

and set $\|a\|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} = \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} + |a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}$. Since D is assumed to be a closed operator on $\mathcal{A}$, D^k is a closed operator on $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$ (see, e.g. [12]). If $\mathcal{A}$ is symmetric and $e \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$ then $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$. [12, 3.7].

We will show that $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$ admits norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{A}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

To extend (10), we need the iterated quotient rule.

Lemma 2.4. *Let* D *be a derivation on* $\mathcal{A}$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. *If* $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$, *then*

$$\mathrm{D}^k(a^{-1}) = \sum_{m=1}^{k} (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots k_m=k \\ k_j \geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{m} [a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^{k_i}(a)]\Big) a^{-1}\,. \tag{11}$$

Since we do not know a precise reference for this rule, we provide a proof in the appendix. A more general formula is contained in [19].

Proposition 2.5. *If* $\mathcal{A}$ *is a symmetric Banach algebra with an unbounded, closed derivation* D *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, *then* $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$ *admits norm-controlled inversion in* $\mathcal{A}$, *and*

$$|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} \leq \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 |a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} \max\Big(k, \frac{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^k |a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}^k - 1}{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} |a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} - 1}\Big)\,. \tag{12}$$

If $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} |a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} > \max(2,k)$ *then this expression can be simplified to*

$$|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} \leq 2\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{k+1} |a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}^k\,. \tag{13}$$

Asymptotically, if $|a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} \leq 1$ *and* $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \delta^{-1}$, *then*

$$|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} \leq 2\delta^{-k-1}\,.$$

Proof. We use the iterated quotient rule (Lemma 2.4). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} &= \sum_{m=1}^{k} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^m(a^{-1})\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{m!} \\
&\leq \sum_{m=1}^{k} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{n=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_n=m \\ m_j \geq 1}} \binom{m}{m_1,\dots,m_n} \Big\| \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^{m_i}(a)\Big) a^{-1} \Big\|_{\mathcal{A}} \\
&\leq \sum_{m=1}^{k} \sum_{n=1}^{m} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{n+1} \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_n=m \\ m_j \geq 1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^{m_i}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{m_i!} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{n+1} \sum_{m=n}^{k} \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_n=m \\ m_j \geq 1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^{m_i}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{m_i!} \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{n+1} \sum_{(m_1,\dots,m_n) \in \{1,\dots,k\}^n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^{m_i}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{m_i!}
\end{aligned}$$

The summation over $(m_1,\dots,m_n)\in\{1,\dots,k\}^n$ yields $(\sum_{m=1}^k \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^m(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{m!})^n = |a|^n_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}|a^{-1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)} &\le \sum_{n=1}^{k}\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{n+1}|a|^n_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}\\ &= \|a^{-1}\|^2_{\mathcal{A}}|a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}\sum_{n=0}^{k-1}\|a^{-1}\|^n_{\mathcal{A}}|a|^n_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}\\ &\le \|a^{-1}\|^2_{\mathcal{A}}|a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}\max\Big(k,\frac{\|a^{-1}\|^k_{\mathcal{A}}|a|^k_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}-1}{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}|a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}-1}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

and this is what we wanted to show. The simplified expression follows by writing $\frac{q^k-1}{q-1}=\frac{q^{k-1}-1/q}{1-1/q}\le q^{k-1}$ for $q=\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}|a|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)}\ge \max(2,k)$. □

Remark. The proposition also follows as a corollary of the technical Theorem 2.14.

2.2. **Automorphism groups and norm-controlled inversion of Besov algebras.** For us a (one-parameter) *automorphism group* on $\mathcal{A}$ is a group of uniformly bounded automorphisms $\Psi=\{\psi_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$. This means that (a) each $\psi_t:\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{A}$ is a Banach algebra automorphism of $\mathcal{A}$, (b) $\psi_s\psi_t=\psi_{s+t}$ for all $s,t\in\mathbb{R}$ and (c) the ψ_t are uniformly bounded, i.e. $M_\Psi=\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|\psi_t\|_{\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{A}}<\infty$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a $*$-algebra we assume that Ψ consists of $*$-automorphisms.

The subalgebra $C(\mathcal{A})$ of continuous elements consists of all elements $a\in\mathcal{A}$ satisfying $\lim_{t\to0}\psi_t(a)=a$.

The *generator* D of Ψ is defined pointwise by $\mathrm{D}(a)=\lim_{h\to0}\frac{\psi_h(a)-a}{h}$. It is a closed derivation, and the domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D},\mathcal{A})$ of D is the set of all $a\in\mathcal{A}$ for which this limit exists. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a $*$-algebra, then D is symmetric. See, e.g. [5].

By means of the automorphism group Ψ we can define the Besov spaces on the Banach algebra $\mathcal{A}$ in complete analogy to the classical Besov spaces on $\mathbb{R}$. Of the many equivalent definitions we choose the following one, see, e.g., [5]. Let $\Delta_t a=\psi_t(a)-a$ be the difference operator and $\Delta_t^k=(\psi_t-\mathrm{id})^k$ be the higher differences. Assume that $1\le p<\infty$, $r>0$, and define $k=\lceil r\rceil$ as the smallest integer greater than or equal to r. Then the Besov space $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$ consists of all $a\in\mathcal{A}$ for which the expression

$$\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}=\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}+\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}}(|t|^{-r}\|\Delta^k_t a\|_{\mathcal{A}})^p\frac{dt}{|t|}\Big)^{1/p}=\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}+|a|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \tag{14}$$

is finite. For $p=\infty$, we use the supremum, as usual. Then (14) is a norm on $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$ and $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$ is a Banach space. If $k=\lceil r\rceil$ is replaced by any integer $k_1>r$ in the preceding definition, then one obtains an equivalent norm on $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$.

The main properties concerning the algebraic structure were derived in [18].

Proposition 2.6 ([18, Thm. 3.7, 3.8])**.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach algebra with a uniformly bounded automorphism group Ψ, $1\le p\le\infty$, and $r>0$.*

(i) Then $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$ is a Banach subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$.

(ii) Ψ is an automorphism group on $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$, and $\|\psi_t(a)\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}\le M_\Psi\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}$.

(iii) $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$ *is inverse-closed in* $\mathcal{A}$.
(iv) Reiteration theorem: If $1 \le p,q \le \infty$ *and* $r,s > 0$ *then*

$$\Lambda^q_s(\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})) = \Lambda^q_{r+s}(\mathcal{A})\,. \tag{15}$$

Like derivations, difference operators obey a product rule and a quotient rule. We may therefore expect that the Besov algebras also admit some form of norm control. A first and easy result follows with the reiteration theorem.

Proposition 2.7. *Let* $1 \le p \le \infty$ *and* $r > 0$. *Then* $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$ *admits norm control, and*

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \le C_{p,r}\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{2^{\lfloor r\rfloor+1}}\,\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}^{2^{\lfloor r\rfloor}}$$

In particular, if $\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \le 1$ *and* $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \le 1/\delta$, *then*

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \le C_r\delta^{-2^r} \tag{16}$$

Proof. (a) Let $0 < r < 1$. The appropriate quotient rule for the difference operator is given by

$$\Delta_t(a^{-1}) = -\psi_t(a^{-1})\,\Delta_t(a)\,a^{-1}\,, \tag{17}$$

after a straightforward computation. Applying the Besov-norm on both sides, we obtain the norm control

$$|a^{-1}|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \le M_\Psi\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2|a|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}\,. \tag{18}$$

Using $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \ge \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \ge 1$, the last relation yields

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} \le 2M_\Psi\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}\,. \tag{19}$$

(b) If $r \ge 1$, set $N = \lfloor r\rfloor + 1$ and $s = r/N = r/(\lfloor r\rfloor + 1) < 1$. Now we apply the reiteration theorem $\Lambda^p_{Ns}(\mathcal{A}) = \Lambda^p_s(\Lambda^p_{(N-1)s}(\mathcal{A}))$, part (ii) of Prop. 2.6 and step (a) repeatedly and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})} &\le 2M_\Psi\|a^{-1}\|^2_{\Lambda^p_{(N-1)s}(\mathcal{A})}\,\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_{Ns}(\mathcal{A})}\\
&\le 2M_\Psi\Big((2M_\Psi\|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda^p_{(N-2)s}(\mathcal{A})}\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_{(N-1)s}(\mathcal{A})}\Big)^2\,\|a\|_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}\\
&\le C_1(2M_\Psi)^3\,\|a^{-1}\|^4_{\Lambda^p_{(N-2)s}(\mathcal{A})}\,\|a\|^3_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}\\
&\le \cdots \le C_N(2M_\Psi)^{2^N-1}\,\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{2^N}\,\|a\|^{2^N-1}_{\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The intermediate constants $C_1,\dots,C_N$ come from the embedding of $\Lambda^p_{(N-l)s}(\mathcal{A})$ in $\Lambda^p_r(\mathcal{A})$. In the final step we have used part (a) of the proof. □

A much better estimate can be derived with an iterated quotient rule for higher differences that is similar to Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 2.8. *If $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is invertible, then*

(20)
$$\Delta_t^k(a^{-1}) = \psi_{kt}(a^{-1}) \sum_{m=1}^{k} (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \psi_{(k-\sum_{l=1}^{j} k_l)t}\big((\Delta^{k_j}a)a^{-1}\big)$$

The proof is purely algebraic and is given in the appendix. Using Lemma 2.8, we obtain the following improved version of norm-controlled inversion in $\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})$.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach algebra with a one-parameter automorphism group Ψ. Then the Besov algebra $\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})$ with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $r > 0$, admits the following norm control in $\mathcal{A}$:*

$$|a^{-1}|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \leq C\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 \|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lfloor r\rfloor+1}\|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})}^{\lfloor r\rfloor+1}-1}{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})}-1}, \tag{21}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ depending on r and p.

In particular, if $\|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \leq 1$, and $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq 1/\delta$, then

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \leq C\delta^{-\lfloor r\rfloor-2}$$

Proof. The iterated quotient rule (20) implies that, for every integer $l > r$, in particular $k = \lfloor r\rfloor + 1$,

$$\|\Delta_t^k(a^{-1})\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq M_\Psi^{k+1}\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \|\Delta_t^{k_j}a\|_{\mathcal{A}}\,.$$

Now choose positive parameters r_j such that $\sum_{j=1}^m r_j = r$. Then

$$|t|^{-r}\|\Delta_t^k(a^{-1})\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq C_k\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\|\Delta_t^{k_j}a\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{|t|^{r_j}}, \tag{22}$$

Note that $|a|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} = \Big\| |t|^{-r}\|\Delta^k a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \Big\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R},dt/t)}$. Taking the $L^p(\mathbb{R},dt/t)$-norms on both sides of (22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|a^{-1}|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} &\leq C_k\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\|\Delta_t^{k_j}a\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{|t|^{r_j}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R},dt/t)} \\
&\leq C_k\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \left\| \frac{\|\Delta_t^{k_1}a\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{|t|^{r(k_1)}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R},dt/t)} \sup_{t\neq 0} \prod_{j=2}^{m} \frac{\|\Delta_t^{k_j}a\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{|t|^{r_j}} \\
&\leq C_k\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} |a|_{\Lambda_{r(k_1)}^p(\mathcal{A})} \prod_{j=2}^{m} |a|_{\Lambda_{r_j}^\infty(\mathcal{A})}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

As $|a|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \leq C\|a\|_{\Lambda_s^q(\mathcal{A})}$ for $r \leq s$ and $q \leq p$ (see, e.g., [5]), we can estimate the product in this expression by

$$\begin{aligned} |a^{-1}|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} &\leq C_k\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m=k \\ k_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m} \|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})}^m \\ &\leq C_k'\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^m \|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})}^m \\ &= C_k'\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2 \|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \frac{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^k \|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})}^k - 1}{\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} - 1} \,. \end{aligned}$$

If $\|a\|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} \leq 1$ and $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \delta$, the resulting asymptotic estimate is

$$\begin{aligned} |a^{-1}|_{\Lambda_r^p(\mathcal{A})} &\leq C\delta^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \delta^{-m} = C\delta^{-2} \frac{\delta^{-k}-1}{\delta^{-1}-1} \\ &\sim C\delta^{-k-1} = C\delta^{-\lfloor r \rfloor -2} \quad \text{for} \quad \delta \to 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. A multivariate version of Theorem 2.9 remains correct, if we start with a commutative d-parameter automorphism group. One can adapt the definition of Besov algebras by using multivariate differences.

2.3. **Bessel Algebras.** For the definition of Bessel algebras we use an extension of the automorphism group Ψ from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$, the algebra of bounded Borel measures. If μ is a bounded measure and $a \in C(\mathcal{A})$, then the *convolution* of μ with a is defined as

$$\mu * a = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_{-t}(a)d\mu(t). \tag{23}$$

This action is a generalization of the convolution of functions and satisfies similar properties, in particular,

$$\|\mu * a\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq M_\Psi \|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})} \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}\,.$$

The convolution can be defined in the more general case that $\mathcal{A}$ is a C_w group, see [18] for the definition. In the following we will assume that the convolution is well-defined and will not dwell on these technicalities.

Bessel potentials are an alternative family of smoothness spaces on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and include the standard Sobolev spaces. For the definition on a Banach algebra with an automorphism group, let $\mathcal{G}_r$ be the *Bessel kernel* that is defined by its Fourier transform as

$$\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G}_r(\omega) = (1+|2\pi\omega|^2)^{-r/2}\,, \quad r > 0.$$

Definition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach space and Ψ a C_w- group [18] acting on $\mathcal{A}$ (in particular, this is the case if $C(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$). The *Bessel potential space* of order $r > 0$ is

$$\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{G}_r * \mathcal{A} = \{a \in \mathcal{A} \colon a = \mathcal{G}_r * y \text{ for some } y \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

with the norm

$$\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})} = \|\mathcal{G}_r * y\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})} = \|y\|_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

We collect the main properties of the Bessel potential spaces on $\mathcal{A}$ from [18].

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach algebra with C_w-group Ψ and $r > 0$.*

(i) Then $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$ is a Banach algebra.

(ii) Ψ is an automorphism group on $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$, and $\|\psi_t(a)\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})} \le M_\Psi \|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}$.

(iii) $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$.

(iv) The following embeddings hold:

$$\Lambda^1_r(\mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow \Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})\,. \tag{24}$$

(v) Reiteration theorem: for all $r,s > 0$

$$\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{P}_s(\mathcal{A})) = \mathcal{P}_{r+s}(\mathcal{A})\,. \tag{25}$$

(v) Characterization by a hyper-singular integral: if $0 < r < 2$, then

$$\|a\|_\mathcal{A} + \sup_{\varepsilon>0} \Big\| \int_{\varepsilon \le |t| \le 1} \frac{\Delta_t(a)}{|t|^r} \frac{dt}{t} \Big\|_\mathcal{A}.$$

is equivalent to the norm $\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}$.

In contrast to the Besov algebras, the original definition of $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$ does not contain derivations or difference operators that satisfy a quotient rule. Nevertheless, using the characterization by a hyper-singular integral, we can prove norm control for $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$.

Theorem 2.12. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a Banach algebra with a C_w-group Ψ, then the Bessel potential space $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$ admits norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{A}$. For $0 < r < 1$, the norm control is given explicitly by*

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})} \le C_r \|a^{-1}\|^3_\mathcal{A} \|a\|^2_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\,.$$

Proof. Assume first that $0 < r < 1$. If $a \in \mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$, then we want to estimate the integral in Lemma 2.11(v). We rewrite the quotient rule (17) as

$$\Delta_t(a^{-1}) = -\Delta_t(a^{-1})\Delta_t(a)a^{-1} - a^{-1}\Delta_t(a)a^{-1}\,,$$

and so

$$\Big\| \int_{\varepsilon \le |t| \le 1} \frac{\Delta_t(a^{-1})}{|t|^r} \frac{dt}{t} \Big\|_\mathcal{A} \le \Big\| \int_{\varepsilon \le |t| \le 1} \frac{\Delta_t(a^{-1})\Delta_t(a)a^{-1}}{|t|^r} \frac{dt}{t} \Big\|_\mathcal{A} + \Big\| \int_{\varepsilon \le |t| \le 1} \frac{a^{-1}\Delta_t(a)a^{-1}}{|t|^r} \frac{dt}{t} \Big\|_\mathcal{A}\,. \tag{26}$$

As $a \in \Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})$ by (24), we have $\|\Delta_t(a)\|_\mathcal{A} \le |t|^r \|a\|_{\Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})}$. Since $\Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$, $a^{-1} \in \Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})$ as well, and we may apply the quotient rule (18). Using these estimates, the first term on the right hand side of (26) is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\varepsilon \le |t| \le 1} \frac{\|\Delta_t(a^{-1})\|_\mathcal{A} \|\Delta_t a\|_\mathcal{A} \|a^{-1}\|_\mathcal{A}}{|t|^r} \frac{dt}{t} &\le \|a^{-1}\|_{\Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})} \|a\|_{\Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})} \|a^{-1}\|_\mathcal{A} \int_\varepsilon^1 |t|^r dt/t \\ &\le C_r \|a^{-1}\|^3_\mathcal{A} \|a\|^2_{\Lambda^\infty_r(\mathcal{A})} \\ &\le C'_r \|a^{-1}\|^3_\mathcal{A} \|a\|^2_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\,.\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequalities we have used the norm control (18) for Besov spaces and the inclusion relation (24) between Bessel and Besov spaces. The second term can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\int_{\varepsilon\le|t|\le 1}\frac{a^{-1}\Delta_t(a)a^{-1}}{|t|^r}\frac{dt}{t}\Big\|_{\mathcal{A}} =&\Big\|a^{-1}\Big(\int_{\varepsilon\le|t|\le 1}\frac{\Delta_t(a)}{|t|^r}\frac{dt}{t}\Big)a^{-1}\Big\|_{\mathcal{A}}\\ \le& C_r\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}.\end{aligned}$$

As $\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\asymp\|a\|+\sup_{0<\varepsilon<1}\Big\|\int_{\varepsilon\le|t|\le 1}\frac{\Delta_t(a^{-1})}{|t|^r}\frac{dt}{t}\Big\|_{\mathcal{A}}$, and $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\ge 1$ we conclude that, for $r<1$,

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\le C_r\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^3\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}^2\,. \tag{27}$$

If $r>1$, an inductive argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.7 shows that, for $\|a\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\le 1$ and $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}\le 1/\delta$ one obtains

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\le C_r\delta^{-3^r}\,. \qquad \square$$

Remarks. (i) Theorem 2.12 remains true for the action of a d-parameter automorphism group, but requires more notations.

(ii) We expect that the correct asymptotic behavior in the Bessel algebra $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$ is of the form

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})}\le C_r\delta^{-r-2}\,.$$

Possibly this could be proved by using equivalent norms for $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{A})$ for $r>2$ that involve a hyper-singular integral with higher differences as in [24], but we do not pursue this detail further.

2.4. **Norm Controlled Inversion in Dales-Davie Algebras.** As a final version of smoothness in the presence of a derivation D we now look at the Dales-Davie algebras. The Dales-Davie algebras are determined by growth conditions on the sequence $\|\mathrm{D}^k(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}, k\in\mathbb{N}_0$ and are related to the Gelfand-Shilov spaces of test functions in analysis. For scalar functions they were introduced in [6].

Definition 2.13. Let $M=(M_k)_{k\ge 0}\subseteq\mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of positive numbers satisfying $M_0=1$ and $\frac{M_{k+l}}{(k+l)!}\ge\frac{M_k}{k!}\frac{M_l}{l!}$ for all $k,l\in\mathbb{N}_0$. The *Dales-Davie algebra* $D_M^1(\mathcal{A})$ consists of the elements $a\in\mathcal{A}$ with finite norm

$$\|a\|_{D_M^1(\mathcal{A})}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}{M_k}^{-1}\|\mathrm{D}^k(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}\,.$$

Then $D_M^1(\mathcal{A})$ is a Banach algebra, and by the results in [19] $D_M^1(\mathcal{A})$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$. See also [1] for a proof in the commutative setting. Once again, this form of smoothness admits norm-controlled inversion.

Theorem 2.14. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach algebra with a closed unbounded derivation* D. *Set*

$$A_m=\Big(\sup\Big\{\frac{k!}{M_k}\prod_{j=1}^m\frac{M_{l_j}}{l_j!}: l_j\ge 1\ \textit{for}\ 1\le j\le m,\ \sum_{j=1}^m l_j=k\Big\}\Big)^{1/m}. \tag{28}$$

If $\lim_{m\to\infty}A_m=0$, *then* $D_M^1(\mathcal{A})$ *admits norm-controlled inversion in* $\mathcal{A}$.

Note that the definition implies that $A_m \le 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and that A_m is a decreasing sequence.

Proof. Once again we use the iterated quotient rule of Lemma 2.4 and proceed as in the proof of Proposition 2.5. Details are therefore left to the reader.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a^{-1}\|_{D^1_M(\mathcal{A})} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^k(a^{-1})\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{M_k} \\
&\le \dots \le \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k!}{M_k} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{m+1} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m = k \\ k_j \ge 1}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^{k_j}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{k_j!} \\
&\le \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{m+1} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m = k \\ k_j \ge 1}} \frac{k!}{M_k} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{M_{k_j}}{k_j!} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^{k_j}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{M_j} \\
&\le \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{m+1} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\dots k_m = k \\ k_j \ge 1}} A_m^m \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^{k_j}(a)\|_{\mathcal{A}}}{M_j} \\
&\le \dots \le \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{m+1} A_m^m (\|a\|_{D^1_M(\mathcal{A})} - \|a\|)^m
\end{aligned}$$

If $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \le 1/\delta$ and $\|a\|_{D^1_M(\mathcal{A})} \le 1$, the last inequality simplifies to

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{D^1_M(\mathcal{A})} \le \delta^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \delta^{-m-1} A_m^m . \tag{29}$$

We now choose an index $m_\delta \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $A_m < \delta/2$ for all $m > m_\delta$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a^{-1}\|_{D^1_M(\mathcal{A})} &\le \delta^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{m_\delta} \delta^{-m-1} A_m^m + \sum_{m=m_\delta+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-m-1} \left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)^m \\
&\le \delta^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{m_\delta} \delta^{-m-1} A_m^m + \sum_{m=m_\delta+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-m-1} \left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)^m \\
&\le \delta^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{m_\delta} \delta^{-m-1} A_m^m + \delta^{-1} \sum_{m=m_\delta+1}^{\infty} 2^{-m} \le 2\delta^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{m_\delta} \delta^{-m-1} A_m^m \\
&\le 2\delta^{-1} + \delta^{-1} \frac{\delta^{-m_\delta} - 1}{\delta^{-1} - 1} \le 4\delta^{-m_\delta} \text{ for } \delta \le 1/2,
\end{aligned}$$

as $A_m \le 1$. Note that m_δ is independent of $\|a^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\|a\|_{D^1_M(\mathcal{A})}$ and depends only on the sequence A_m and thus on $M_k/k!$. □

Let us work out several important special cases.

(i) If $M_k = 1/k!$ for $k \le K$ and $M_k = 0$ for $k > K$, then $D^1_M(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^K)$. We may choose $m_\delta = K+1$ independent of δ and recover the statement of Proposition 2.5.

(ii) If $M_k = 1/k!$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $D^1_M(\mathcal{A})$ is an algebra of analytic elements in $\mathcal{A}$. In this case $A_m = 1$ and Theorem 2.14 is not applicable. This is not surprising, because we already know that this subalgebra is not inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$ [19].

(iii) If $M_k = 1/k!^r$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for some $r > 1$, then a straightforward calculation shows that

$$A_m = \sup_{l_j \geq 1} \Big(\frac{l_1! \cdots l_m!}{(l_1 + \cdots + l_m)!} \Big)^{\frac{r-1}{m}} = m!^{\frac{1-r}{m}}, \tag{30}$$

which tends to 0 for $m \to \infty$ and $r > 1$. In [19] it is shown that $D^1_{k!^r}(\mathcal{A})$ is inverse-closed in $\mathcal{A}$ if $r > 1$. In this case the estimate (29) reads as

$$\|a^{-1}\|_{D^1_{k!^r}(\mathcal{A})} \leq \delta^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^{-m-1}}{m!^{r-1}} = \delta^{-1} v_{r-1}(\delta^{-1}) \tag{31}$$

where we have introduced the weight function

$$v_r(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{|x|^l}{l!^r}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

3. NORM CONTROLLED INVERSION IN MATRIX ALGEBRAS WITH OFF- DIAGONAL DECAY

The goal of this section is twofold. First we will show that the asymptotic estimates obtained for smooth subalgebras are almost sharp. To do so, we test on a particular class of Banach algebras consisting of matrices with off-diagonal decay. Then we will investigate norm-controlled inversion in subalgebras of $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$. While the abstract methods of Section 2 can be exploited to construct subalgebras of $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$ with norm-controlled inversion, the standard matrix algebras that describe off-diagonal decay conditions do not fall under this theory. In this case the arguments are much more sophisticated and essentially due to Baskakov [2].

3.1. **Matrix Algebras.**

First we define the standard classes of matrices with off-diagonal decay. For more comprehensive treatments see, e.g., [2, 3, 14, 16, 23]. In the following A is always a matrix over the index set $\mathbb{Z}$ with entries $A(k,l), k,l \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The *Jaffard algebra* $\mathcal{J}_r$, $r > 1$, is defined by the norm

$$\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} = \sup_{k,l \in \mathbb{Z}} |A(k,l)|(1+|k-l|)^r. \tag{32}$$

Explicitly, $A \in \mathcal{J}_r \Leftrightarrow |A(k,l)| \leq C(1+|k-l|)^{-r}$, so the norm of $\mathcal{J}_r$ describes polynomial decay off the diagonal.

Assume that the weight v on $\mathbb{Z}$ is submultiplicative and satisfies the GRS condition, i.e., v satisfies $v(0) = 1$, $v(k+l) \leq v(k)v(l)$, and $\lim_{|k| \to \infty} v(k)^{1/k} = 1$. Then the *algebra of convolution-dominated matrices* $\mathcal{C}_v$, (sometimes called the Baskakov-Gohberg-Sjöstrand algebra) consists of all matrices A, such that the norm

$$\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_v} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} |A(l,l-k)| v(k) \tag{33}$$

is finite. For the polynomial weights $v(k) = (1+|k|)^r$, $r > 0$ we use the abbreviation $\mathcal{C}_r$.

The crucial observation to apply the abstract theory of Section 2 is the identification of weighted matrix algebras with smoothness spaces. Precisely, the automorphism group is

$$\psi_t(A) = M_t A M_{-t}, \quad M_t x(k) = e^{2\pi i k t} x(k)\,,$$

and the corresponding derivation is defined entrywise as $\mathrm{D}(A)(k,l) = (k-l)A(k,l)$. Then the following identifications hold [12, 18, 19].

$$\mathcal{J}_r = \Lambda^{\infty}_{r-1-\varepsilon}(\mathcal{J}_{1+\varepsilon}), \quad r-1-\varepsilon > 0, \varepsilon > 0\,, \tag{34}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_r = \Lambda^1_r(\mathcal{C}_0), \quad r > 0\,, \tag{35}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{v_M} = D^1_M(\mathcal{C}_0), \quad \text{where } v_M(k) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} |k|^l M_l^{-1}\,. \tag{36}$$

These results combined with Theorems 2.9 and 2.14 show that (i) $\mathcal{C}_r$ and $\mathcal{C}_{v_M}$ admit norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{C}_0$ with a precise expression for the controlling function, and that likewise (ii) $\mathcal{J}_r$ admits norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{J}_{1+\varepsilon}$.

3.2. **Optimality of the Asymptotic Estimates.** We use the matrix algebras defined above to test whether the estimates of the control function h obtained in Section 2 are asymptotically sharp. This will be done by comparing the norm of the inverse of an operator in $\mathcal{C}_r$ to the norm in $\mathcal{C}_0$. (A similar test could have been carried out in $\mathcal{J}_{s+r}$ and $\mathcal{J}_s$, but it is quite tedious to obtain the estimates.)

To avoid distraction, we note right away that

$$e^{\gamma}\gamma^{-r-1}\Gamma(r+1) \le \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1)^r e^{-\gamma k} \le 2e^{\gamma}\gamma^{-r-1}\Gamma(r+1)\,. \tag{37}$$

This follows immediately from the integral test. The infinite series can be expressed by a polylogarithm.

For $0<\gamma<1$ we define the operator $C_\gamma = \mathrm{id} - e^{-\gamma}T_1$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, where the translation operator is $T_k x(l) = x(l-k)$. Then C_γ is a Toeplitz matrix with ones on the main diagonal and the value $e^{-\gamma}$ on the first side diagonal. The inverse of C_γ is given by the geometric series

$$C_\gamma^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma k} T_k\,.$$

With the help of (37) the norms of C_γ and C_γ^{-1} in $\mathcal{C}_r$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|C_\gamma\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} &= 1 + 2^r e^{-\gamma}, \\ \|C_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1+k)^r e^{-\gamma k} \asymp e^{\gamma}\Gamma(r+1)\gamma^{-r-1}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

We set

$$\widetilde{C}_\gamma = \frac{1}{1+2^r e^{-\gamma}} C_\gamma\,,$$

so that $\|\widetilde{C}_\gamma\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} = 1$. Comparing (38) for $r=0$ and general $r>0$, we obtain that

$$\|\widetilde{C}_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_0} \asymp (1+e^{-\gamma})e^{\gamma}\gamma^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma \to 0$$

whereas

$$\|\widetilde{C}_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-r-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma \to 0\,.$$

Setting $1/\delta = \|\widetilde{C}_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_0}$, we obtain

$$\|\widetilde{C}_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} = \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-r-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad \delta \to 0\,. \tag{39}$$

This should be compared with Theorem 2.9 which yields the asymptotic rate $\mathcal{O}(\delta^{-\lfloor r\rfloor-2})$. For integer values $r = k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)(\mathcal{C}_0)$, and Proposition 2.5 shows that $\mathcal{O}(\delta^{-k-1})$ is the precise asymptotic rate for the norm control of $\mathcal{C}_k$ in $\mathcal{C}_0$.

Next we discuss norm-controlled inversion for weights in the Dales-Davie algebras for matrices and weights with super-polynomial growth. We restrict our attention to the special kind of subexponential weights

$$v_r(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{|x|^k}{k!^r}, \quad r > 0\,, \tag{40}$$

that have been introduced earlier. As stated in (36) above, $\mathcal{C}_{v_r} = D^1_{k!^r}(\mathcal{C}_0)$. Therefore we already know that for a matrix $A \in \mathcal{C}_0$ satisfying $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} \leq 1$ and $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_0} \leq 1/\delta$, the inverse matrix satisfies

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} \leq \delta^{-1} v_{r-1}(\delta^{-1})\,. \tag{41}$$

For comparison we determine the growth of the weight v_r more exactly.

Lemma 3.1. *The function* $\phi_r(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k!^r}$ *is an entire function of order* $1/r$ *and of type* r*. As a consequence, for every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists an* x_ε*, such that*

$$v_r(x) = \phi_r(|x|) < e^{(r+\varepsilon)|x|^{1/r}}$$

for $|x| > x_\varepsilon$*.*

Proof. Recall that for an entire function $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k x^k$, the order ρ_f and the type σ_f are defined as $\rho_f = \overline{\lim}_{k\to\infty} \frac{k \log k}{\log(1/|a_k|)}$, and $\sigma_f = (\rho_f\, e)^{-1}\, \overline{\lim}_{k\to\infty} k |a_k|^{\rho_f/k}$ respectively, see, e.g., [20]. A straightforward calculation with Stirling's formula for $k!$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\phi_r} &= \overline{\lim_{k\to\infty}} \frac{k \log k}{\log k!^r} = \overline{\lim_{k\to\infty}} \frac{k \log k}{r k \log k} = 1/r\,,\\
\sigma_{\phi_r} &= \frac{r}{e}\, \overline{\lim_{k\to\infty}}\, k(k!^{-1/k}) = r\,.
\end{aligned}$$

□

In order to test the sharpness of the estimate (41), we use again the Toeplitz matrix $C_\gamma = \mathrm{id} - e^{-\gamma} T_1$. The identification (36) of $\mathcal{C}_{v_r}$ with a Dales-Davie algebra leads to the following expression for the norm of C_γ in $\mathcal{C}_{v_r}$

$$\|C_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} = \|C_\gamma^{-1}\|_{D^1_{(k!^r)}(\mathcal{C}_0)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\|\mathrm{D}^k(C_\gamma{}^{-1})\|_{\mathcal{C}_0}}{k!^r}$$

As $\mathrm{D}(A)(k,l) = (k-l)A(k,l)$, the norm in each term is

$$\|\mathrm{D}^k(C_\gamma{}^{-1})\|_{\mathcal{C}_0} = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^k e^{-\gamma j} \asymp e^{\gamma} \gamma^{-k-1} \Gamma(k+1)\,,$$

again with (37). So we obtain

$$\|C_\gamma^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} \asymp \gamma^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{(1/\gamma)^k}{k!^{r-1}} = \frac{1}{\gamma}v_{r-1}\big(\frac{1}{\gamma}\big)\,.$$

The comparison with (31) shows that the estimate (41) is asymptotically sharp.

3.3. **Norm Control of Matrix Algebras in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$.** Norm-controlled inversion of the Jaffard algebra $\mathcal{J}_r$ and the algebra of convolution dominated matrices of polynomial decay $\mathcal{C}_r$ in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$ has been first investigated in a fundamental paper of Baskakov [2]. To formulate his main result, we need some notation.

Assume that $A \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and let $d_A(k) = \sup_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}|A(l,l-k)|$ be the supremum of the k-th side diagonal of A. The error of approximating A by k-banded matrices in $\mathcal{C}_0$ is then $E_k(A) = \sum_{|m|\geq k+1} d_A(m)$. We also need the quantities

$$\ell_r(A) = 8\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\Big(1-\frac{1}{24\kappa(A)+1}\Big)^k(1+k)^r\,, \quad r>0\,, \tag{42}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\ell}_r(A) = \gamma_r\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}\Big(1-\frac{1}{24\kappa(A)+1}\Big)^k(1+k)^r\,, \quad r>1\,.\text{[1]} \tag{43}$$

The constant γ_r comes from the from the convolution inequality $v_r^{-1} * v_r^{-1} \leq \gamma_r v_r^{-1}$ for the polynomial weight function $v_r(k) = (1+|k|)^r$ and can be estimated by $\gamma_r \leq 2^{r+1}\frac{r+1}{r-1}$.

Furthermore, we need the function

$$\Phi_{A,r}(t) = \min\{k\in\mathbb{N}\colon\ \max\Big(2\cdot 3^r k^{-r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}\ell_r(A), 2E_k(A)\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\Big) \leq t\}\,. \tag{44}$$

Then a simplified version of Baskakov's result for the matrix algebras $\mathcal{J}_r$ and $\mathcal{C}_r$ reads as follows. [2]

Theorem 3.2 ([2, Thm. 6]). *Assume that A is invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$.*

(i) *If $A \in \mathcal{C}_r$ and $r>0$, then $A^{-1}\in\mathcal{C}_r$, and*

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} \leq 4\ell_r(A)\inf_{0\leq t\leq 1/2}\Phi_{A,r}(t)(1+\Phi_{A,r}(t))^r\,.$$

(ii) *If $A\in\mathcal{J}_r$ and $r>1$, then $A^{-1}\in\mathcal{J}_r$, and*

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} \leq 4\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)\Big(2+\big(2\cdot 3^r\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)\big)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}\Big)^r \qquad (*)\text{[3]}$$

---

[1] In [2] the constant $24 = 4\cdot 3\cdot 2$ seems to be misspelled as $8\cdot 32$. In the following the precise value is not important.

[2] The most general version contains more parameters that we have already eliminated.

[3] In [2] the formula $(*)$ is stated incorrectly as

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} \leq 4\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)\Big(2+\big(2\cdot 3^r\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)\big)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}\Big)\,.$$

Since the definition of $\ell_r(A)$ and $\Phi_{A,r}$ involves the norms $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}$ and $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}$ and the approximation error $E_k(A)$, Theorem 3.2 can be interpreted as a form of norm control for $\mathcal{C}_r$ and $\mathcal{J}_r$ in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$. Baskakov's theorem is rather deep, but unfortunately the result as stated provides little information about the nature of the control function. In the following we derive an explicit expression for the control function by using some approximation properties of the matrix algebras $\mathcal{C}_r$ and $\mathcal{J}_r$.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that A is invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$.*

(i) *If $A \in \mathcal{C}_r$ and $r > 0$, then $A^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}_r$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} &\le C_r \|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{1+\frac{1}{r}} \|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+\frac{2}{r}+3} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+\frac{2}{r}+5} \\ &\le C_r \|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{2r+\frac{3}{r}+4} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+\frac{2}{r}+5}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} \le 1$, and $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \le 1/\delta$, then

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} \le C_r \delta^{-2r-\frac{2}{r}-5} \quad \text{as} \quad \delta \to 0.$$

(ii) *If $A \in \mathcal{J}_r$ and $r > 1$, then $A^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}_r$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} &\le \widetilde{C}_r \|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}^{1+\frac{1}{r-1}} \|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+1+\frac{1}{r-1}} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+3+\frac{2}{r-1}} \\ &\le \widetilde{C}_r \|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}^{2r+2+\frac{2}{r-1}} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+3+\frac{2}{r-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} \le 1$, and $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \le 1/\delta$,

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} \le \widetilde{C}_r \delta^{-2r-\frac{2}{r-1}-3} \quad \text{for} \quad \delta \to 0.$$

Proof. We divide the proof of (i) into several steps. We note right away that for the polynomial weights $(1+|k|)^r$ the function $\Phi_{A,r}(t)$ is decreasing, therefore we may replace $\inf_{0\le t\le 1/2} \Phi_{A,r}(t)$ by $\Phi_{A,r}(1/2)$. We will enumerate the intermediate constants consecutively by $c_1, c_2, \dots$ and emphasize that these depend only on r, but not on A.

Step 1: We first estimate $\ell_r(A)$. Set $\beta = \frac{1}{24\kappa(A)+1}$. Then $\beta < 1/2$ and $(1-\beta)^{-1} \le 2$. Using (37) with $\gamma = \log(1-\beta)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_r(A) &= 8\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1-\beta)^k (1+k)^r \\ &= 8\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1+k)^r e^{-k\log(1-\beta)^{-1}} \\ &\le 16\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \frac{\Gamma(r+1)}{(1-\beta)(\log(1-\beta)^{-1})^{r+1}}. \qquad (45)\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{\log(1-\beta)^{-1}} \le 1/\beta = 24\kappa(A)+1 \le 25\kappa(A)$$

by the Taylor expansion of $\log(1-x)$, (45) implies that

$$\ell_r(A) \le c_1 \|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+1} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+2}. \tag{46}$$

Step 2: We use (46) to estimate $\Phi_{A,r}(1/2)$. Obviously,

$$c_2 k^{-r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}\ell_r(A) \le \tfrac{1}{2}$$

is satisfied, if

$$c_2 k^{-r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+1}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+2} \le \tfrac{1}{2}\,.$$

For this we need

$$k \ge c_3\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{1/r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1+1/r}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1+2/r}\,. \tag{47}$$

The second term in (44) is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} E_k(A) = \sum_{|m|\ge k+1} d_A(m) &= \sum_{|m|\ge k+1} d_A(m)(1+|m|)^r(1+|m|)^{-r} \\ &\le (1+k)^{-r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} \le k^{-r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}\,. \end{aligned}$$

So the inequality

$$2E_k(A)\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \le \tfrac{1}{2}$$

is satisfied for

$$k \ge 4^{1/r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{1/r}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1/r}\,. \tag{48}$$

As (47) is stronger than (48), possibly after adjusting the constants, we obtain

$$\Phi_{A,r}(1/2) \le c_4\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{1/r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1+1/r}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1+2/r}\,. \tag{49}$$

Step 3: We combine the estimates for $\ell_r(A)$ and $\Phi_{A,r}$ and substitute in condition (i) of Theorem 3.2. In conclusion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r} &\le 4\ell_r(A)\Phi_{A,r}(\tfrac{1}{2})(1+\Phi_{A,r}(\tfrac{1}{2}))^r \\ &\le c_5\ell_r(A)(\Phi_{A,r}(1/2))^{r+1} \\ &\le c_6\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+1}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+2}\Big(\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{1/r}\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1+1/r}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{1+2/r}\Big)^{r+1} \\ &= C_r\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}^{\frac{r+1}{r}}\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+3+1/r}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{2r+5+2/r}\,. \end{aligned}$$

The estimates for δ follow now immediately.

The estimate for $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}$ follows in a similar, but simpler fashion from Theorem 3.2(ii). We now need to estimate $\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)$. Using again $\beta = \frac{1}{24\kappa(A)+1} < 1/2$ and arguing as in (46), we obtain the estimate for $\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\ell}_r(A) &= \gamma_r\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\sup_{k\ge 0}(1-\beta)^k(1+k)^r \\ &= \gamma_r\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\frac{e^{-r}r^r}{(1-\beta)(\log(1-\beta)^{-1})^r} \\ &\le c_7\|A\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}^{r+1}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Then according to Theorem 3.2(ii),

$$\begin{aligned}\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{J}_r} &\leq 4\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)\Big(2+\big(2\cdot 3^r\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)\big)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}\Big)^r \\ &\leq c_8\widetilde{\ell}_r(A)(\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}\widetilde{\ell}_r(A))^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \\ &\leq c_9\|A\|^r_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\|A^{-1}\|^{r+1}_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\Big(\|A\|_{\mathcal{J}_r}\|A\|^r_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\|A^{-1}\|^{r+1}_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\Big)^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \\ &= \widetilde{C}_r\|A\|^{\frac{r}{r-1}}_{\mathcal{J}_r}\|A\|^{2r+1+\frac{1}{r-1}}_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\|A^{-1}\|^{2r+3+\frac{2}{r-1}}_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

The remaining assertions are immediate. □

Remarks. (i) With some painful bookkeeping of the constants in each step one may give a numerical value for the constants in Proposition 3.3. For C_r we have obtained the value $C_r = 128\cdot 50^r\cdot 64^{1/r}\Gamma(r+1)^{1+1/r}$. The main insight of the explicit norm control is how the off-diagonal decay depends on the condition number of A. However, the growth of C_r in r shows that the off-diagonal decay is effective only in an asymptotic range.

(ii) The unraveling of an explicit norm control function is relatively straightforward when compared to the depth of Baskakov's Theorem, but we believe that the explicit version in Proposition 3.3 is much more accessible and will be useful in some applications.

(iii) As in all statements about norm-controlled inversion, the quality of the norm control degrades as the smoothness parameter r tends to infinity. In addition, if $r\to 0$, then norm-controlled inversion for $\mathcal{C}_r$ also deteriorates. This is compatible with the fact that $\mathcal{C}_0$ does not admit norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$, because $\mathcal{C}_0$ contains the algebra of absolutely convergent Fourier series as a commutative closed subalgebra.

(iv) For the commutative algebra of Toeplitz matrices in $\mathcal{C}_r$ and $\mathcal{J}_r$ the following estimates can be found in [8, Sec. 3.8.4 (ii)]. If A is a Toeplitz matrix in $\mathcal{C}_r$, $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}\leq 1$ and $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)}\leq 1/\delta$, then

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_r}\leq\begin{cases}C\delta^{-4r-2} & \text{for } r>1,\\ C\delta^{-(r+1)^2(4r+1)/r^2-2} & \text{for } r>0\,.\end{cases}$$

This is weaker than Proposition 3.3, but on the other hand, the techniques of [8] work for much more general commutative Banach algebras.

3.4. **Super-algebraically growing weights.** Baskakov's approach does not work for weights of super-polynomial growth. (This is not obvious from the general assumptions of [2], but becomes clear in his Lemma 3, where a "doubling condition" is required. If a submultiplicative weight v satisfies the condition $\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}v(km)/v(k)<\infty$ for $m\geq 2$, then v grows at most polynomially.) To obtain norm-controlled inversion for the the case of weights with super-polynomial growth, we combine the results on Dales-Davie algebras with the transitivity of norm-controlled inversion, and we obtain the norm-controlled inversion for convolution dominated matrices with subexponential decay off the diagonal. Although the following statement is probably far from optimal, it is the first result of this type for non-commutative matrix algebras.

Proposition 3.4. *If* $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} \le 1$ *and* $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \le 1/\delta$ *then*

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} \le C_0\delta^{-9} v_{r-1}(C_1\delta^{-9}) \le C\delta^{-9}\exp\left(C_1'(r-1+\varepsilon)\delta^{-\frac{9}{r-1}}\right).$$

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{C}_{v_r} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_s$ for all $s \ge 0$ and $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_s} \le \|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} = 1$, therefore Proposition 3.3(i) implies that

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_0} \le \|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_s} \le C_s\delta^{-2s-\frac{2}{s}-5} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}.$$

Now, since $\mathcal{C}_{v_r}$ admits norm-controlled inversion in $\mathcal{C}_0$, the explicit version of Theorem 2.14 in (41) implies that

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{v_r}} \le \frac{1}{\varepsilon} v_{r-1}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) = C_s\delta^{-2s-\frac{2}{s}-5} v_{r-1}\left(C_s\delta^{-2s-\frac{2}{s}-5}\right).$$

Now choose the optimal value $s = 1$. □

Remark. For the commutative subalgebra of Toeplitz matrices and the sub-exponential weight $v(k) = \exp(|k|^{1/r})$, in [8] the following estimate was obtained: if $\|A\|_{\mathcal{C}_v} \le 1$ and $\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\ell^2)} \le 1/\delta$, then

$$\|A^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{C}_v} \le C\delta^{-2}\log\delta^{-1}\exp(C\delta^{-\frac{2}{r-1}}).$$

As so often, the technique for commutative Banach algebras is vastly different from the non-commutative case and yields a better result.

APPENDIX A. ITERATED QUOTIENT RULES

In the following algebraic formulations we use the product $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i = a_1a_2\dots a_n$ and should be aware the multiplication is in general non commutative.

Lemma A.1. *Let* D *be a derivation on* $\mathcal{A}$ *with* $e \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. *If* $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D}^k)$, *then*

$$\mathrm{D}^k(a^{-1}) = \sum_{1\le m\le k}(-1)^m \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots k_m=k\\ k_j\ge 1}} \binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m}\Big(\prod_{i=1}^m [a^{-1}\mathrm{D}^{k_i}(a)]\Big)a^{-1} \tag{50}$$

Proof. Since $e \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{D})$, we have $\mathrm{D}(e) = 0$. The proof is by induction. For $k = 1$ the assertion is true. The induction step $k-1 \to k$ is proved with the help of the iterated Leibniz rule $\mathrm{D}^k(a^{-1}a) = \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j}\mathrm{D}^j(a^{-1})\mathrm{D}^{k-j}(a)$ and $\mathrm{D}^k(e) = 0$. Using the induction hypothesis on $\mathrm{D}^j(a^{-1})$ for $j < k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{D}^k(a^{-1}) = -\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\binom{k}{j}\mathrm{D}^j(a^{-1})\mathrm{D}^{k-j}(a)\,a^{-1} &= -a^{-1}\mathrm{D}^k(a)a^{-1}\\ -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\binom{k}{j}\sum_{m=1}^{j}(-1)^m \sum_{\substack{j_1+\cdots j_m=j\\ j_l\ge 1}}\binom{j}{j_1,\dots,j_m}&\Big(\prod_{l=1}^m[a^{-1}\mathrm{D}^{j_l}(a)]\Big)a^{-1}\mathrm{D}^{k-j}(a)\,a^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Interchanging the outer sums, we then obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{D}^k(a^{-1}) =& -a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^k(a)a^{-1}\\
&-\sum_{m=1}^{k-1}(-1)^m\sum_{j=m}^{k-1}\binom{k}{j}\sum_{\substack{j_1+\cdots j_m=j\\ j_l\geq 1}}\binom{j}{j_1,\dots,j_m}\Big(\prod_{l=1}^{m}[a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^{j_l}(a)]\Big)a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^{k-j}(a)\,a^{-1}\\
&= -a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^k(a)a^{-1}-\sum_{m=1}^{k-1}(-1)^m\sum_{\substack{j_1+\cdots j_{m+1}=k\\ j_l\geq 1}}\binom{k}{j_1,\dots,j_{m+1}}\Big(\prod_{l=1}^{m+1}[a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^{j_l}(a)]\Big)a^{-1}\\
&= -a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^k(a)a^{-1}+\sum_{m=2}^{k-1}(-1)^m\sum_{\substack{j_1+\cdots j_m=k\\ j_l\geq 1}}\binom{k}{j_1,\dots,j_m}\Big(\prod_{l=1}^{m}[a^{-1}\,\mathrm{D}^{j_l}(a)]\Big)a^{-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

and this is (11). □

Lemma A.2. *If $\Psi=(\psi_t)$ is an automorphism group on $\mathcal{A}$, then the following iterated product and quotient rules are valid for all $a,b\in\mathcal{A}$:*

$$\Delta_t^k(ab)=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}\psi_{(k-l)t}(\Delta_t^l a)\Delta_t^{k-l}b \tag{51}$$

(52)

$$\Delta_t^k(a^{-1})=\psi_{kt}(a^{-1})\sum_{m=1}^{k}(-1)^m\sum_{\substack{k_1+\ldots k_m=k\\ k_j\geq 1}}\binom{k}{k_1,\dots,k_m}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\psi_{(k-\sum_{l=1}^{j}k_l)t}\big((\Delta_t^{k_j}a)a^{-1}\big)$$

Proof. We start from the identity

$$\Delta_t(ab)=\psi_t(a)\Delta_t(b)+\Delta_t(a)b\,, \tag{53}$$

which is (51) for $k=1$ and can be verified by direct computation. Now we proceed by induction. If $k>1$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_t^k(ab)=\Delta_t^{k-1}(\Delta_t(ab)) &= \Delta_t^{k-1}\big(\psi_t(a)\Delta_t(b)+\Delta_t(a)b\big)\\
&=\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\binom{k-1}{l}\psi_{(k-1-l)t}(\Delta_t^l(\psi_t a))\Delta_t^{k-1-l}(\Delta_t b)\\
&+\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\binom{k-1}{l}\psi_{(k-1-l)t}(\Delta_t^{l+1}a)\Delta_t^{k-1-l}b
\end{aligned}
$$

We obtain (51) after re-indexing the second sum ($l\to l+1$) and using an identity for binomial coefficients.

To prove the quotient rule for difference operators we start the induction with (17), which is (52) for $k=1$. The induction step for $k>1$ is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4. As

$$0=\Delta_t^k(aa^{-1})=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}\psi_{(k-l)t}(\Delta_t^l a)\Delta_t^{k-l}(a^{-1})=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}\psi_{lt}(\Delta_t^{k-l}a)\Delta_t^l(a^{-1})\,,$$

we obtain

$$\Delta_t^k(a^{-1}) = -\psi_{kt}(a^{-1}) \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \psi_{lt}(\Delta_t^{k-l} a)\Delta_t^l(a^{-1}) .$$

Using the induction hypotheses for $\Delta_t^l(a^{-1})$ for $l < k$ in the last expression we proceed as follows:

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \psi_{lt}(\Delta_t^{k-l} a)\Delta_t^l(a^{-1}) = \Delta_t^k(a)a^{-1}$$

$$+\sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \psi_{lt}(\Delta_t^{k-l} a)\psi_{lt}(a^{-1}) \sum_{m=1}^{l} (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{l_1+\ldots l_m=l \\ l_j\geq 1}} \binom{l}{l_1,\ldots,l_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \psi_{(l-\sum_{r=1}^{j} l_r)t}\big(\Delta^{l_j}(a)a^{-1}\big)$$

$$= \Delta_t^k(a)a^{-1} + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \sum_{m=1}^{l} (-1)^m \psi_{lt}\big(\Delta_t^{k-l}(a)a^{-1}\big) \binom{k}{l} \sum_{\substack{l_1+\ldots l_m=l \\ l_j\geq 1}} \binom{l}{l_1,\ldots,l_m} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \psi_{(l-\sum_{r=1}^{j} l_r)t}\big((\Delta^{l_j} a)a^{-1}\big)$$

$$= \Delta_t^k(a)a^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} (-1)^m \sum_{l=m}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{l_1+\ldots l_m=l \\ l_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{l} \binom{l}{l_1,\ldots,l_m} \psi_{lt}\big(\Delta_t^{k-l}(a)a^{-1}\big) \prod_{j=1}^{m} \psi_{(l-\sum_{r=1}^{j} l_r)t}\big((\Delta^{l_j} a)a^{-1}\big) .$$

Substituting $l_{m+1} = k-l$ the last line simplifies to

$$\Delta_t^k(a)a^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{l_1+\ldots l_{m+1}=k \\ l_j\geq 1}} \binom{k}{l_1,\ldots,l_{m+1}} \prod_{j=1}^{m+1} \psi_{(k-\sum_{r=1}^{j} l_r)t}\big((\Delta^{l_j} a)a^{-1}\big) , \tag{54}$$

and we are done. □

REFERENCES

[1] M. Abtahi and T. G. Honary. On the maximal ideal space of Dales-Davie algebras of infinitely differentiable functions. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 39(6):940–948, 2007.

[2] A. G. Baskakov. Asymptotic estimates for elements of matrices of inverse operators, and harmonic analysis. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 38(1):14–28, i, 1997.

[3] A. G. Baskakov. Estimates for the elements of inverse matrices, and the spectral analysis of linear operators. *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.*, 61(6):3–26, 1997.

[4] O. Bratteli. *Derivations, Dissipations and Group Actions on C^*-algebras*, volume 1229 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[5] P. L. Butzer and H. Berens. *Semi-groups of operators and approximation*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 145. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1967.

[6] H. G. Dales and A. M. Davie. Quasianalytic Banach function algebras. *J. Functional Analysis*, 13:28–50, 1973.

[7] S. Demko, W. F. Moss, and P. W. Smith. Decay rates for inverses of band matrices. *Math. Comp.*, 43(168):491–499, 1984.

[8] O. Èl′-Falla, N. K. Nikol′skiĭ, and M. Zarrabi. Estimates for resolvents in Beurling-Sobolev algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, 10(6):1–92, 1998.

[9] K. Gröchenig. *Foundations of time-frequency analysis*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.

[10] K. Gröchenig. Localization of frames, Banach frames, and the invertibility of the frame operator. *J.Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 10(2), 2004.

[11] K. Gröchenig. Wiener's lemma: Theme and variations. an introduction to spectral invariance. In B. Forster and P. Massopust, editors, *Four Short Courses on Harmonic Analysis*, Appl. Num. Harm. Anal. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2010.

[12] K. Gröchenig and A. Klotz. Noncommutative approximation: Inverse-closed subalgebras and off-diagonal decay of matrices. *Constructive Approximation*, 32:429–446, 2010.

[13] K. Gröchenig and A. Klotz. Norm-controlled inversion in smooth banach algebras, i. *Preprint*, 2012.

[14] K. Gröchenig and M. Leinert. Symmetry and inverse-closedness of matrix algebras and functional calculus for infinite matrices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 358(6):2695–2711 (electronic), 2006.

[15] K. Gröchenig, Z. Rzeszotnik, and T. Strohmer. Convergence analysis of the finite section method and Banach algebras of matrices. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 67(2):183–202, 2010.

[16] S. Jaffard. Propriétés des matrices "bien localisées" près de leur diagonale et quelques applications. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 7(5):461–476, 1990.

[17] E. Kissin and V. S. Shul′man. Dense Q-subalgebras of Banach and C^*-algebras and unbounded derivations of Banach and C^*-algebras. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2)*, 36(2):261–276, 1993.

[18] A. Klotz. Spectral Invariance of Besov-Bessel Subalgebras. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 164:268–296, 2012.

[19] A. Klotz. Inverse Closed Ultradifferential Subalgebras. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2012.

[20] B. Y. Levin. *Lectures on entire functions*, volume 150 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. In collaboration with and with a preface by Yu. Lyubarskii, M. Sodin and V. Tkachenko, Translated from the Russian manuscript by Tkachenko.

[21] N. Nikolski. In search of the invisible spectrum. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 49(6):1925–1998, 1999.

[22] J.-L. Romero. Explicit localization estimates for spline-type spaces. *Sampl. Theory Signal Image Process.*, 8(3):249–259, 2009.

[23] Q. Sun. Wiener's lemma for infinite matrices with polynomial off-diagonal decay. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 340(8):567–570, 2005.

[24] R. L. Wheeden. On hypersingular integrals and Lebesgue spaces of differentiable functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 134:421–435, 1968.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, NORDBERGSTRASSE 15, A-1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: `karlheinz.groechenig@univie.ac.at`

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, NORDBERGSTRASSE 15, A-1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: `andreas.klotz@univie.ac.at`